DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 219 SO 013 721

AUTHOR Conover, Pamela Johnston; And Others
TITLE 'Pro-Family vs. Pro-Woman': Elite-Mass Linkages on Family Issues.
PUB DATE Sep 81
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (New York, NY, September 3-6, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Abortions; Activism; Attitude Measures; Family (Sociological Unit); *Family Role; Females; *Feminism; *Politics; Public Opinion; Social Science Research; Tables (Data); *Voting
IDENTIFIERS Equal Rights Amendment

ABSTRACT

This paper exp. res single-issue politics by examining voting patterns on abortion and Equal Rights Amendment (E.R.A.) issues. The concept of single-issue politics refers to any issue which generates a significant amount of single-minded voting and/or political behavior. Major objectives of the study were to consider factors which were likely to influence behavior towards single-issues and to test some ideas about single-issue politics on two controversial issues--abortion and the E.R.A. The authors employed two major methods. First, they reviewed literature on voting and single-issue politics. Second, they carried out a survey of attitudes toward single-issue politics based on mass data (a telephone survey of 1,228 randomly selected Minnesota residents) and political activist data (a questionnaire administered to participants at the White House Conference on Families, 1980). From the general overview of political literature, the authors present a number of findings, including that existing treatments of single-issue politics tend to ignore the general dynamics underlying such issues in favor of more narrow focus on a particular issue and that, in order for a policy question to be labeled a single issue, a number of people must respond to it in a single-minded fashion. From their surveys of Minnesota residents and participants at the White House Conference on Families, the authors present additional findings. Among these findings are that there is a higher rate of single-issue voting at the activist level than at the mass level and that people with extremely favorable or extremely negative opinions on abortion and the E.R.A. tend to single-issue vote more than do moderates. It is concluded that some activists are keeping the battle over abortion and the E.R.A. intense by cuing the masses into a pattern of single-issue voting. Tables of data are presented in the appendix. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210219

DEC 7

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

'Pro-Family vs. Pro-Woman': Elite-Mass Linkages on Family Issues

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Virginia Gray
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Pamela Johnston Conover
University of Kentucky

Virginia Gray
University of Minnesota

Steven Coombs
Minneapolis Tribune

SP013721

Prepared for delivery at the 1981 Annual Meeting of The American Political Science Association, The New York Hilton Hotel, September 3-6, 1981.
Copyright by The American Political Science Association.

ABSTRACT

'Pro-Family vs. Pro-Woman': Elite-Mass Linkages on Family Issues

By Pamela Johnston Conover, University of Kentucky; Virginia Gray, University of Minnesota; Steven Coombs, Minneapolis Tribune

In this paper we consider the abortion and E.R.A. issues as examples of single-issue politics, as well as the nature of single-issue politics in general. We argue that many single-issues are what others have called "easy" issues but that "hard-issue" voting as well as "easy-issue" voting may be occurring on any issue. The degree of ideologically motivated issue voting versus "easy-issue" voting is a matter for empirical testing. In our investigation we employ two sets of data: one at the mass level (a 1980 survey of Minnesota residents) and one at the activist/elite level (a 1980 survey of delegates to the White House Conference on Families).

We find a higher rate of single-issue voting at the activist level than at the mass level. Also those with extremely favorable or extremely negative opinions on abortion and E.R.A. tend to single-issue vote more than do the moderates. Among masses and activists there is more single-issue voting against both issues than for both issues. At the mass level, however, dynamics differ on the two sides: on the pro side, it is clearly a case of "easy-issue" voting; on the anti side, it is more nearly a case of "hard-issue" voting. Among activists, single-issue voting tends to be "hard-issue" voting on both sides. We argue that some activists are cuing the masses into a pattern of single-issue voting, and hence keeping the battle over abortion and the E.R.A. intense.

Over the past decade, abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment have been two issues which have generated considerable controversy among the American public. In fact, the struggle over these two issues has been so intense that pollsters and politicians alike have labeled both the E.R.A. and abortion as prime examples of "single-issue" politics. Yet, despite their prominence in the public's eye, we have relatively little understanding of why abortion and the E.R.A. stimulate this type of politics. From a broader perspective, abortion and the E.R.A. are not the only single-issues to appear on the American political scene in the last ten years. Pollster Peter Hart, (Newsweek, 1978:54), for example, estimates that fully one-fourth of American voters are willing to vote against an incumbent on the basis of his or her position on some single-issue. But, despite the apparently rapid spread of single-issue politics and its enormous potential for changing the nature of our party system, political scientists have relatively little knowledge about how and why such issues emerge. Existing treatments of single-issue politics tend to ignore the general dynamics underlying such issues in favor of a more narrow focus on a particular issue (see for example, Anderson, 1980; Casey, 1980; Jones, 1980; and Merrick and Frank, 1980).

This paper attempts to remedy some of the deficiencies noted above. First, we consider the general nature of single-issues. In this regard, we argue that it is critical to recognize that single-issue politics is not only a behavioral phenomenon but also one of public opinion. Second, with this in mind, we explore those factors which are likely to influence behavior towards single-issues. Finally, through a focus on the issues of abortion and the E.R.A., we test some of our ideas about single-issue politics.

SINGLE-ISSUE POLITICS

Although the phrase "single-issue politics" has been given considerable attention by the mass media in recent months, definition of the term has been curiously ignored in the scholarly literature. This may be because the concept is a difficult one to define since it has meaning at both the individual and aggregate levels. At the individual level, the term typically denotes an issue which stimulates people to behave in a "single-minded" fashion, in the sense that the issue totally dominates other considerations (such as party, ideology, and other issues) in determining their behavior. At the aggregate level, the phrase "single-issue" conjures up an image of a policy question which has generated not only intense, but also widespread, public concern and group activity. We chose to define the concept so that it encompasses both levels. Specifically, we define a "single-issue" as any issue which generates a significant amount of "single-minded" behavior among some public, where "single-minded behavior" is described as the willingness of an individual to allow one issue to guide his or her participation in politics.

To elaborate, it is critical to recognize that though an individual may respond to a particular issue in a single-minded fashion, in order for that policy question to be labeled a "single-issue" a number of people must react in that same manner. Strictly speaking, single-issues do not exist at the individual level; rather they are a phenomenon characterizing the opinion of some public--be it local, state, or national. This suggests that policy concerns which are single-issues in some states may not be described as such in other states. Similarly, a controversy over public policy may represent a single-issue for one side of the public but not the other.

Given this definition, two topics merit further examination. First, what are some of the characteristics of single-issues? That is, what sorts of issues are likely to trigger single-minded behavior among substantial portions of the public? Secondly, what types of people are likely to engage in single-minded behavior? A complete treatment of either of these topics could constitute a paper in and of itself. For this reason, we chose to focus primarily on the second question. Nonetheless, let us begin by briefly considering the nature of single-issues, since knowledge of this is essential to understanding what motivates widespread single-minded behavior among the public.

The Nature of Single-Issues

Once any issue has been introduced to the public by various political actors, it undergoes a process of issue definition or symbolization.[1] As Bennett (1980: 249) explains, all issues constitute a "symbolic representation of a problem or state of affairs" no matter how dry, concrete or seemingly emotionless they may appear. Furthermore, because the public definition of an issue often structures individual reactions to it, we argue that this process of issue definition or symbolization is the key to understanding the attraction of single-issues. In particular, it is posited that two aspects of the symbolization process--the mode and the type--are critical in distinguishing single-issues from other issues.

To explain, in defining an issue the mode of symbolization may be either "referential" or "condensational" (Bennett, 1980; Cobb and Elder 1973; and Edelman, 1964). Referential symbols reduce the scope of meaning associated with an issue by defining it in specific, concrete, neutral

terms. In contrast, condensational symbols expand the scope of meaning associated with an issue by defining it in abstract, ambiguous, emotionally-charged terms. In this regard, we posit that the definition of single-issues will tend to be in condensational, rather than referential, terms. In effect, single-issues are those issues which are "bigger than themselves" in the sense that they are defined in terms of symbols which evoke extraordinarily strong emotional reactions and substantive meanings so ambiguous that people can read into the issues virtually any meaning that they care to.

Second, the type of symbols used in the definition of an issue is also important in understanding single-issues. In this regard, Cobb and Elder (1973) suggest a typology of political symbols which we have broadened so that it includes symbols which pertain to four types of objects: the community, societal norms, formal roles and organizations, and situational settings. With respect to this sort of hierarchy of symbols, Cobb and Elder (1973) posit that there should be greater significance and common affective sentiment attached to the higher-order or first category of symbols. As a consequence, when conflicts erupt around higher-order symbols they are likely to attract a larger number of people than those conflicts centered around lower-order symbols. Given this, we argue that single-issues will be symbolized most frequently in terms of higher-order symbols, which have the potential to generate more widespread interest and stronger emotional reactions than lower-order symbols.

Furthermore, to argue that single-issues are defined condensationally primarily in terms of higher-order symbols implies several things about how people respond to such issues. In particular, individuals are expected to

acquire the affect toward higher-order symbols relatively early in life, and this affect should be stronger and more stable than that attached to lower-order symbols. Consequently, these symbols are likely to be central to individual belief systems. This suggests that people are interpreting and responding to single-issues in terms of very basic symbols whose meaning has been shaped over time by long-standing attitudinal predispositions and personality characteristics. Described in this fashion, single-issue politics is the epitome of "symbolic politics"--a politics governed by affective responses to political objects (Sears, Lau, Tyler, and Allen, 1980:681).

Finally, our characterization of single-issues as symbolic in nature has certain implications for our understanding of the life-cycle of such issues. First, although clearly there may be some variation in the length of their life-cycles, it is expected that in the majority of cases policy questions will have evolved into single-issues over time, rather than developing suddenly as an issue of that status. In effect, it may take some time for an issue to develop the broad symbolization necessary to generate the sort of emotional appeal that would lead to its being characterized as a single-issue. Furthermore, in many instances, this transformation of a policy question into a single-issue may be linked to interest groups which seek to "expand the scope of conflict"--to use Schattschneider's (1960) term--by investing the original issue with broader, more emotional meaning.

Secondly, the pattern of the life-cycle of a single-issue may not follow a simple progression from non-single-issue, to single-issue, to non-issue. In a somewhat paradoxical fashion, the same process of

broadening symbolization that originally contributed to the emergence of a single-issue may eventually bring about its demise as a "pure" single-issue in the sense that over time the issue may come to be symbolized so broadly that its meaning greatly overlaps that of other issues.[2] For example, for some people the Equal Rights Amendment has come to symbolize their sentiments on a variety of other issues ranging from homosexuality to the sanctity of the American family (Crawford, 1980). When the meaning of a single-issue becomes so broad and ambiguous that it symbolizes a number of other more specific issues, it may become useful to cease referring to the issue as a "pure" single-issue, and instead to conceptualize of it as some sort of "mega-issue." Clearly, this is a conceptual problem that needs to be confronted in future considerations of single-issues. At any rate, these two arguments about the life-cycle of single-issues suggest that the most likely candidates for pure single-issues are those policies which, though they have been on the public agenda for a relatively long time, have yet to be fully incorporated into existing party cleavages or other groupings of issues.

Single-Issues and Political Behavior

Rather than attempting to validate the accuracy of our conceptualization of single-issues (which would require comparisons across all types of issues), we will use the previous discussion to help guide our examination of how individuals respond to single-issues. To begin with, just as there is variation across issues in terms of which are most likely to become single-issues, so there should also be variation across individuals in terms of who is likely to respond in a "single-minded" fashion to any given single-issue. In attempting to identify which individuals will be more

attracted to single-minded behavior, it is important to recognize that there are a number of political behaviors which may be pursued in a single-minded fashion. For example, people may single-issue vote, join a single-issue group, or even engage in a protest over a single-issue. Furthermore, although to some extent the general dynamics predisposing a person to behave in a single-minded fashion may be similar across behaviors, there may also exist significant differences from behavior to behavior. For this reason, our discussion will focus primarily on single-issue voting since that is the behavior with which we will be concerned in our empirical analysis.

In explaining a variety of single-minded behaviors including single-issue voting, one factor that is likely to be quite important is the intensity of an individual's attitudes on the issue in question. The symbols relevant to defining a particular issue may evoke extraordinarily intense reactions from some people and only mild responses from others. Given this, with respect to a specific single-issue, we would expect to find more single-minded behavior among those people with the most extreme, intensely-held attitudes. It is doubtful, however, that behavioral responses to single-issues may be explained entirely in terms of the simple transformation of extreme attitudes into single-minded behavior. With respect to most single-issues, it seems unlikely that <u>all</u> people with intense attitudes engage in single-minded behavior, nor is it probable that <u>all</u> single-minded behavior is linked to individuals with extreme attitudes. Given this, in explaining any particular type of single-minded behavior, we must focus on two questions. First, what factors facilitate or hinder the transformation of extreme attitudes into single-minded behavior? And second, what factors encourage single-minded

behavior in the absence of extreme attitudes? With this in mind, let us consider the specific act of single-issue voting.

From our perspective, single-issue voting is clearly a case of issue voting. Yet, as Carmines and Stimson (1980:8) note, there are different kinds of issue voting; "hard-issue" voting involves the "conscious calculation of policy benefits for alternative electoral choices," while "easy-issue" voting represents a very simple "gut" response to an issue. Furthermore, with respect to any one issue, Carmines and Stimson (1980) argue that the amount of hard vs. easy issue voting depends to a large degree on the nature of the issue itself. To elaborate, they describe easy issues as (1) being symbolic in nature, (2) dealing with policy ends rather than means, and (3) as being long on the political agenda. As a consequence of these characteristics, voters need little information or political sophistication in order to ascertain the relative positions of parties and candidates; easy issues are--as their name implies--very easy to issue vote on. In contrast, in order to issue vote on a hard issue, voters must possess both information about the stands of candidates and parties as well as the conceptual sophistication necessary to digest that information.

How does single-issue voting fit into this two-fold view of issue voting? Based on our earlier discussion, it would appear that single-issues constitute an example of what Carmines and Stimson (1980) have labeled "easy" issues. In particular, our conceptualization of single-issues fits rather easily with the notion that easy issues are symbolic in nature and deal with policy ends rather than means. Similarly, it would appear necessary that single-issues--issues which, by definition,

have existed long enough to influence the behavior of a considerable portion of the public--would have enjoyed a relatively long tenure on the public agenda. Thus, upon first examination, it seems more likely that single-issue voting is a case of easy-issue, rather than hard-issue, voting. Consequently, single-issue voters should resemble easy-issue voters, who Carmines and Stimson (1980) have characterized as being relatively low in education, political information, and political activity. In effect, political sophistication or the lack of it may be a key factor influencing the fashion in which extreme attitudes are or are not transformed into single-issue voting.

Two sets of dynamics might underlie the manner in which a lack of political sophistication contributes to single-issue voting. First, a lack of political sophistication and knowledge might actually facilitate the transformation of extreme attitudes into single-issue voting. In effect, "unsophisticated" voters might find it easier simply to translate their strong attitudes on a single "easy" issue into a vote choice, rather than attempting to obtain the information necessary to issue vote on other policy questions about which they feel intensely. In contrast, knowledgeable, cognitively sophisticated voters might have several issues--some "easy" and some "hard"--about which they feel strongly; given their political sophistication they could conceivably engage in issue voting on a number of those issues. Secondly, the relative ease with which a person can issue vote on "easy" issues might entice some individuals--particularly those with relatively little political knowledge and sophistication--into single-issue voting on a policy question about which they do not feel especially strongly. In effect, some individuals may single-issue vote simply because it represents a low cost way of decision-making, rather than because of their intense

feelings on the issue in question.

Clearly, such a conceptualization of single-issues as easy issues, and consequently single-issue voting as easy issue voting, would tend to support the popular media's depiction of single-issue voting as an act attributable mainly to "narrow-minded", uninformed voters. Yet, while it may be tempting to join the media in derogating single-issue voters and voting alike, one suspects that the characterization of single-issue voting as "pure" easy-issue voting is perhaps a little too simple. The problem lies in the fact that the correspondence between the nature of an issue and the type of issue voting which it produces is not necessarily as direct as Carmines and Stimson (1980) might have us believe. In particular, it is critical to recognize that while the nature of easy-issues undoubtedly encourages easy-issue voting, it does not necessarily preclude so-called hard-issue voting. Consequently, although the symbolic nature of single-issues may stimulate widespread easy-issue voting, one should not assume that all single-issue voting is of that variety. Under some circumstances, political sophistication may actually act as a stimulus to single-issue voting; well-informed voters may, in fact, choose to single-issue vote as a consequence of careful deliberation over the costs and benefits of such action. Thus, the degree to which single-issue voting constitutes easy vs. hard-issue voting is a matter requiring empirical testing.

In the analysis which follows, we seek to provide such a test. In particular, with regard to the issues of abortion and the E.R.A., we consider the following questions. First, to what degree does single-issue voting reflect the straightforward, simple translation of extreme attitudes

into single-minded behavior? Secondly, to what extent does a lack of political sophistication both facilitate the transformation of extreme attitudes into single-minded behavior and encourage such behavior among those who do not feel intensely about an issue? Finally, does the nature of single-issue voting--the degree to which it reflects easy vs. hard-issue voting--vary according to the single-issue involved?

DATA

In examining the above questions, two sets of data are employed; one deals with a mass public while the other concerns a group of political activists. Specifically, the mass data were collected in Minnesota in April 1980 by way of a telephone poll which was composed of a random sample of 1228 residents of the state of Minnesota.[3] Minnesota has a mixed background with respect to the two issues that will be considered. While the state has been one of the biggest battlegrounds for the fight over the morality and legality of abortion, the Equal Rights Amendment has prompted relatively little controversy since its ratification by the Minnesota state legislature.

The political activist data set was gathered at the White House Conference on Families held in Minneapolis, Minnesota in June 1980. As one of three federally-sponsored conferences on the family, this conference was composed of delegations from thirteen midwestern and southern states--a composition which made this conference perhaps the most conservative of the three. Individual members of each state delegation were either appointed by the governor or a member of the conference's state staff, or they were elected at a state or local conference

on the family. In a number of states, both types of delegate selection produced heated controversy among three distinct groups: trained professionals who deal with the family (such as social workers); members of "liberal" organizations such as the National Organization for Women, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the National Abortion Rights League; and members of so-called "New Right" groups such as STOP E.R.A., the Moral Majority, and the Pro-Family Forum. Because the delegations represented a mixture of these groups, it was felt that the conference afforded an excellent opportunity to study activists on both sides of the issues of abortion and the E.R.A.

In contrast to a number of previous examinations of political activists (e.g. Brady and Tedin, 1976; Wolfinger et al., 1969), we were able to exercise considerable control over the nature of our sample. Specifically, rather than having to rely totally on haphazard sampling methods, we were able to draw a random sample of delegates from certain select states. In order to ensure an adequate number of conservatives in our final sample, we focused on the five states in attendance which had not yet ratified the Equal Rights Amendment--Arkansas, Illinois, Louisiana, Missouri and Mississippi. In each of those states, we randomly selected half of the delegates to be interviewed. Furthermore, because of the availability of comparable data at the mass level in Kentucky and Minnesota, we sought to interview all of the members of those two delegations. Overall, we were able to complete personal interviews with approximately 71% (107) of the delegates originally targeted for interviewing (about 20% of the delegates attending the conference).[4]

METHODS

Dependent Variables

In assessing single-issue voting on the issues of abortion and the E.R.A., two factors needed to be taken into account: the presence of the behavior and its direction. With respect to the latter, attitudes on abortion were measured in terms of the respondents' reactions to seven questions. Specifically, they were asked if it should be "possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if..."

(1) there is a strong chance of serious defect in the baby?
(2) she is married and does not want any more children?
(3) the woman's health is seriously endangered by the pregnancy?
(4) the family has a very low income and cannot afford any more children?
(5) she became pregnant as a result of rape?
(6) she is not married and does not want to marry the man?
(7) the woman wants it for any reason?

Taken together, these items form a Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of .93 for the mass sample and .96 for the activist sample, and a coefficient of scalability of .76 for the mass sample and .88 for the activist sample. Given this, the "yes" responses to these questions were summed to produce a scale ranging from "0" (never approves) to "7" (always approves). As Table 1 illustrates, attitudes towards abortion are distributed differently in the two samples, with the activists demonstrating a greater tendency towards extreme attitudes.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Evaluations of the Equal Rights Amendment were measured in terms of responses to a question concerning whether the individual favored or opposed the amendment, with high scores indicating opposition. The possible responses and the distribution of respondents on them are

presented in Table 2. As in the case of abortion, extremist responses are more prevalent among the activists. In addition, one finds a more equal distribution of responses among the activists. In contrast, among the mass sample, attitudes are skewed towards the pro-E.R.A. side.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

The behavior single-issue voting is assessed by responses to the question(s) "Do you think you would vote for a candidate for public office based only on his or her stand on the abortion question (Equal Rights Amendment)?" It is possible that our question wording may have discouraged positive responses so that the true number of single-issue voters is somewhat higher. However, we are trying to get at the core single-issue voters, not just those for whom the issue is one important factor among many or only those who would vote against a candidate. The voters responding to our question are stating the intention of behaving single-mindedly when it comes to voting in the future. They are potential single-issue voters who might be joined in any particular election by others voting in the same manner. Obviously, our measure does not tap the actual behavior of voting. To do that, one would have to demonstrate that the voter voted for the candidate whose issue position agreed with his/hers and that the vote was intentionally single-minded. Our surveys were not done at the time of our election which might afford such an opportunity. However, we believe that the establishment of single-minded intentions (and admitting them to an interviewer) is as useful as trying after the fact to establish reasons for voting.

Independent Variables

In previous work (Conover, Coombs, Gray, 1980) we argued that the important symbols in the battle over abortion and over the E.R.A. include the family (for the opposition) and the women's movement (for the supporters). The emergence of the women's movement in the early 1970s coincided with the emergence of new lines of class conflict between the "new intelligentsia" and the "new bourgeoise" so that "women libbers" became associated with the rejection of traditional values (Skerry, 1978). Confirming our argument and other research on attitudes toward abortion and the E.R.A., we found the following:

(1) Attitudes towards abortion and the E.R.A. are strongly influenced by three attitudinal orientations which are linked to the women's movement and which help to define symbolic conceptions of the family: the definition of appropriate sex roles, a sense of personal morality, and the appropriateness of women's participation in the labor market. Those individuals favoring changing sex roles, the "new morality," and women's greater equality in the labor market support abortion and the E.R.A., while those with opposing points of view reject these issues.

(2) Because of its centrality to the new class conflict (Ladd, 1978), political liberalism-conservatism--and the basic choice between "change" and the "preservation of traditional values" that it embodies--influences attitudes towards abortion and the E.R.A. Specifically, liberals favor the two issues, while conservatives oppose them.

(3) Because of its relationship with political liberalism-conservatism, personal morality, and sex role orientation, religiosity also influences

attitudes towards abortion and the E.R.A., with the more religious being strong opponents of the two issues.

It is our contention in this paper that when these four longstanding attitudinal orientations (sex roles, morality, women's status, and liberalism) are intensely held, single-minded behavior results. We expect to find extreme and consistent attitudes on these four dimensions among many single-issue voters, i.e., those single-issue voting for ideological reasons. Furthermore, we expect that religiosity reinforces the link between these attitudes and abortion/E.R.A. opinions; for this reason extreme religiosity leads to single-issue voting on these issues. Finally, we expect that some single-issue voters (those voting for non-ideological reasons) will be drawn from the ranks of the politically unsophisticated, where political sophistication is conceptualized so that it pertains to one's education and income.

The four attitudinal and three demographic variables were measured as follows:

First, liberal-conservative identification was measured by the respondent's self-classification as either a liberal (1); moderate (3); or a conservative (5).[6]

Next, sex roles were assessed in terms of four questions concerning relationships among family members. Respondents were asked whether they agreed strongly, agreed, were uncertain, disagreed, or disagreed strongly that: (1) a working mother can establish as warm a relationship with her children as a non-working mother; (2) it is much better if the man is a wage-earner while the woman stays at home; (3) pre-school children suffer if their mothers work; and (4) it is more important for a wife to help her

husband's career rather than have one herself.[7] Responses to all four questions were combined to form a scale ranging from "4 to 20" and having a reliability of .82. Low values indicate "traditional" conceptions of sex roles, while high scores represent "liberated" perspectives on the topic.

Third, perceptions of women's status in the labor market were tapped by three questions concerning whether society or the individual is responsible for the relatively lower status of women. In particular, respondents were asked which idea in each pair they agreed with most: (1) qualified women can't get good jobs or men are more qualified for jobs with responsibility; (2) by nature, women prefer homemaking or society makes women prefer the home; and (3) men have more top jobs because they are born with more ambition or because women are discriminated against.[8] Responses were scored "1" for traditional answers indicating that the individual or nature was responsible for the status of women; "2" if they were uncertain; and "3" for answers suggesting that society and discrimination account for the status of women. Responses were then summed to form a scale ranging from "traditional" perceptions of society to "liberated" ones (3 to 9), with a reliability of .60.

Fourth, an individual's sense of personal morality was measured according to whether the respondent approved or disapproved of: (1) pre-marital sex; (2) homosexual sex; (3) the distribution of birth control information; and (4) whether they thought pornography leads to a breakdown of morals.[9] Responses to these items were summed to form a scale ranging from "4 to 17" and having a reliability of .73. Low scores indicate a "traditional" morality, while high scores represent a more "liberated"

perspective.

Education was measured in terms of the number of years of education which the respondent had received. Income was measured in terms of total family income in 1979, coded in $5000 intervals. Finally, religiosity was assessed by a question on church attendance; those attending frequently were given high scoes.

FINDINGS

The Amount of Single-Issue Voting

Among the mass public our question identifies relatively few single-issue voters: 6.8% of the respondents on the E.R.A. and 9.0% on abortion, according to Table 3. However, this does not diminish their potential to alter electoral outcomes; if only 5% of the electorate targets its votes in a consistent fashion this may shift the margin of victory from one candidate to another. In the activist sample a much higher rate of single-issue voting is observed: 22.1% on the abortion question and even more, 29.2%, on the E.R.A. question.[10] The activists have even more potential than do the masses to alter electoral outcomes due to their other single-minded activities. Our respondents report being moderately to highly involved in electoral politics and interest group activities. The differences at the mass and activist levels in the amount of single-issue behavior suggests that "hard-issue" voting as well as "easy-issue" voting may be encapsulated in the phenomenon of single-issue politics. We assume, obviously, that activists possess more information and political sophistication than do the masses; hence, they more nearly resemble "hard-issue" voters than do the masses.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Single-Issue Voting and Attitudes on Abortion and the E.R.A.

In seeking explanations for the phenomenon of single-issue voting, we first focus on the degree to which single-issue voting represents the simple translation of extreme opinions into single-minded behavior. Extremists with intensely held attitudes should be more likely to engage in single-issue voting than will moderates on the abortion and E.R.A. issues. Table 4 presents the relationship of willingness to single-issue vote with opinion on the E.R.A. For this issue the propensity to single-issue vote is more marked for those holding extreme opinions (strongly favor or oppose) than for those holding more moderate opinions. This pattern generally holds for the mass sample and somewhat for the activist sample.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Table 5 reports the same information for the abortion issue. Instead of the modest curvilinear pattern we observed for the E.R.A., the propensity to single-issue vote on abortion seems to be linearly related to the direction of the opinion. In both samples single-issue voting is highest among the strong opponents, decreases among moderates, and decreases again among strong proponents.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Looking at both Tables 4 and 5, we observe a difference between the masses and the activists. Opinion extremity would appear to be more highly related to single-issue voting at the activist level than at the mass level. There is more single-issue voting among activists, and it is more concentrated at the extremes of the opinion distribution than is true for

the masses. A second difference (which sometimes obscures the first) to be seen in the tables is a discrepancy between the pros (proponents of the E.R.A. or abortion) and the antis (opponents of those issues). The antis are much more likely to single-issue vote than are the pros; this pattern is especially pronounced for the activists where more than half single-issue vote. The predominance of single-issue voting among activists who are extreme opponents suggests that single-issue voting is more than just "easy-issue" voting. We assume that these active intense opponents are knowledgeable, cognitively sophisticated voters, at least on the issues of abortion and the E.R.A.

Single-Issue Voting and Mass Behavior

Having described the extent of single-issue voting and its relation to opinion, it is time to explore the factors which might influence the translation of those extreme opinions into single-issue behavior. We begin this exploration at the mass level. We will also want to explore what prompts single-issue voting in the absence of extreme opinions, a condition observed more among the masses than among activists. Opinion extremity and non-issue specific factors--such as political sophistication--may interact in either a reinforcing or cross-cutting fashion. Thus, we want to look at a series of individual relationships rather than at an overall relationship which might mask these interactions.

Methodology

Given that single-issue voting may not be a simple function of either opinion extremity or political sophistication, we will compare the single-issue voters with the non-voters holding extreme opinions. For the purposes of this comparison we created four groups out of the mass sample: pro voters,

pro extremists, anti voters, and anti extremists on the abortion issue. A similar set of four groups was created for the E.R.A. issue. Our purpose is to compare the pro voters with the pro extremists (nonvoters) with respect to their attitudes linked to abortion (sex roles, women's status, liberalism, morality), their church attendance (our measure of religiosity) and their sophistication (education and income). If single-issue voters are attitudinally and demographically typical of those holding strong opinions on the issue of abortion, then we will infer that extremism is being translated directly into single-issue behavior. If they are atypical in some respect, then some other factor may be prompting the single-minded behavior rather than the opinion itself.

In order to make these comparisons, we collapsed the independent variables into three categories such that one-third of the scale positions fell into each category.[11] Income and education were divided into four categories. Then we constructed a profile of each group (pro voter etc) to see if the attitudinal and demographic composition of the groups differs.

Finally, as a multivariate technique we will use discriminant analysis, including all seven independent variables. Discriminant analysis is an appropriate technique to use when the dependent variable is categorical (e.g., single-issue voter or not) and the independent variables are interval. The goal is to derive the function(s) which best distinguishes between groups composing the categorical variable. We perform separate analyses for pros and antis because of the differences between the two sides reported above. We believe that such differences suggest that pros and

antis may symbolize the same issue very differently; hence, the discriminating functions should be different (i.e., combinations of different variables).

E.R.A. Issue

We begin with the profile of voters and extremists on the E.R.A. issue presented in Table 6. Looking first at the anti side, we see that the single-issue voters are representative of the extremists in terms of attitudes. On two of the attitudinal variables--morality and sex roles--voters are even more conservative than are the extremists. Furthermore, the voters tend to have somewhat lower education and income levels than do the extremists, though the means are not significantly different. Thus they may be less sophisticated than those with extreme attitudes who do not single-issue vote. In sum, it is difficult to tell whether voting by antis is an act of "easy-issue" voting or "hard-issue" voting. The antis are somewhat unsophisticated like "easy-issue" voters; however, they are consistently conservative in attitudinal structure like "hard-issue" voters.

INSERT TABLE 6 HERE

The picture is clearer when we turn to the profile of pro voters and extremists in Table 6. The pro voters are not representative of the extremists with respect to their attitudes. On most attitudinal orientations the pro voters are more conservative, not more liberal, than the extremists. This raises the possibility that single-issue voting on the pro side is likely to be "easy-issue" voting since they pros do not have a consistent ideological position. This interpretation is bolstered by the difference in sophistication: the voters tend to have less education and less income than do the extremists, indicating "easy-issue" voters.

The dynamics of single-issue voting seem to differ on the two sides of the issue. On the pro side, a relative lack of sophistication, rather than ideology, seems to be the key factor in producing single-issue voting. On the anti side, there appears to be a fairly straight translation of extreme attitudes into single-minded behavior, perhaps facilitated by a lack of sophistication.

Discriminant analysis may be used as an aid in ascertaining the differences between the pros and antis and their comparable nonvoting extremists. The first two columns of Table 7 provide the relevant information for the E.R.A. issue. We are moderately successful in discriminating; unfortunately, the results are ambiguous as to the pro-anti differences. Looking at the group centroids (the typical position for each groups of the dependent variable) and the canonical correlations (the degree of relatedness betweeen the groups and the discriminant function), it seems that it is a little easier to differentiate voters and extremists on the pro side than on the anti side. This is what one would expect if the anti voters are representative of the anti extremists and the pro voters are not typical of their counterparts. However, the percentage correctly classified suggests that we can more successfully discriminate (with this set of variables) on the anti side than on the pro side. The structure coefficients (the similarity between a variable and the function, unaffected by multicollinearity) indicate, as did the profiles, that education is the most important variable on the pro side. Education is even more important on the anti side as a discriminating variable; this argues for the combined effect of lack of sophistication and ideology in prompting single-issue voting.

Abortion Issue

The profile of voters and extremists on the abortion issue, reported in Table 8, shows somewhat the same pattern apparent for the E.R.A. On the anti side the single-issue voters are characteristic of extremists on attitudes and church attendance. If anything, the voters are more conservative than the extremists on most dimensions. In terms of sophistication, the voters are more educated and richer than are the extremists. These two findings suggest that anti voters are "hard issue" voters rather "easy-issue" voters. The picture is clearer here than on the E.R.A. issue, where both "hard" and "easy" issue voting seemed to be going on.

INSERT TABLE 8 HERE

On the pro side, we find the same pattern as for the E.R.A. The pro single-issue voters are not typical of extremists; rather than being more liberal (as one might expect if their issue voting were ideologically motivated), the voters are quite a bit more conservative on the attitudinal variables and on church attendance. Once again we see that the pro voters have less education and lower incomes than do the extremists, which suggests that single-issue voting in favor of the E.R.A. is a case of "easy-issue" voting rather than hard-issue voting.

The results of the discriminant analysis found in Table 7 bolster this argument. As expected, we can't distinguish very well between the anti voters and extremists (using as criteria the group centroids, the cannonical correlations, or the percentage correctly classified). In contrast, we can differentiate fairly well between the pro voters and pro extremists (again using the same three criteria). Anti voters are quite similar to their counterparts with church attendance being the most important distinguishing characteristic. Pro voters are fairly different

from their counterparts with sex roles having the largest structure coefficient (but remember its sign was in the "wrong" direction).

Single-Issue Voting and Political Activists

In the last section we found fairly consistent differences between these single-issue voting for an issue and those voting against. Those voting against appear to be more ideologically motivated (i.e., more like "hard-issue" voters) than do those voting for. The latter appear to be more akin to "easy-issue" voters. What could account for these differences at the mass level? One possible explanation drawn from the public opinion and agenda formation literatures is that the masses are taking their cues from political elites and/or activists.

The general outlines of the issue formation process are clear (Bennett, 1980, p. 229): elites and interest groups initiate a majority of political issues; the issues in turn are defined by the mass media and communicated to the public. Thus, interest groups and the media tell the public what to think about and how to think about it. The public's response to the presentation of the issue then determines its place on the systemic agenda and whether ultimately it is placed on the institutional agenda. To understand the evolution of the abortion and E.R.A. issues, then, one needs to understand how the mass media has defined the issues and how activists/elites have symbolized the issues.

In this project we undertake the latter task: how do activists think about these issues? Are issues defined differently on the pro side than on the anti side? If we find that activists on one side have a single-minded strategy and activists on the other side do not, it may help us to understand the behavior we found at the mass level as well as the

eventual outcome of these struggles.

Methodology

The creation of variables for the profiles and the discriminant analysis parallels that in the mass sample with one key exception--we compare single-issue voters to all nonvoters, not just extremists. This procedure allows a larger number of cases (the total activist sample is only 107). We did replicate the mass analysis using extremists and found only slight differences, probably because there were relatively few non-extremists among the activists. Given this, we felt we should use the set of variables producing the largest number of cases. Still, there are so few pro-abortion single-issue voters in the activist sample that no analysis is done on that side of the abortion issue.

E.R.A. Issue

Unlike the mass sample, the dynamics underlying single-issue voting on the E.R.A. issue appear to be similar for both sides of the issue. As shown in Table 9's profiles, both pro and anti single-issue voters are similar to pro and anti nonvoters in terms of ideology but just more extreme. Anti-E.R.A. voters are even more conservative and traditional in sex roles, perceptions of women's status, and morality than are the comparable nonvoters.[12] Similarly, pro-E.R.A. voters are even more liberated than comparable nonvoters. This pattern is in direct contrast to that found in the mass sample. On our measures of sophistication both sets of single-issue voters are similar to the comparable set of nonvoters, that is, they are roughly equally well-educated and well-off. Church attendance, or rather the lack of it, seems to be important in separating the pro voters from the pro nonvoters. In summary, for activists

single-issue voting appears to be a logical extension of an extreme philosophy. Sophistication (or the lack of it) appears to play little role in facilitating the translation of extreme attitudes on the E.R.A. into single-minded behavior at the activist level. Rather, extreme and consistent ideology seems to be the key factor in converting extreme attitudes into single-minded behavior.

The results from the discriminant analysis found in Table 10 bear out this argument. By our usual criteria, we are able to distinguish quite well on both the pro and the anti sides (though best on the anti side); certainly, our ability to discriminate is much better at the activists' level than it was among the masses. The overall importance of ideological factors--and the minor importance of income and education--is clearly revealed by the structure coefficients. Also lack of church attendance is shown again to be important for the pro-E.R.A. voters.

Abortion Issue

Our analysis of the abortion activists is hampered by the absence of pro single-issue voters to analyze; therefore, our analysis in Table 11 is only of anti activists. On the anti-abortion side one finds the same sort of dynamics in operation as in the case of the E.R.A. at the activist level. Anti-abortion single-issue voters differ from nonvoters chiefly in terms of more extreme ideological orientations. They are even more conservative and traditional than the nonvoting opponents. The voters and nonvoters are roughly equal in terms of income and education, suggesting that lack of sophistication is not producing their issue voting. In effect, their single-issue voting seems to be more a case of "hard" rather than "easy-issue" voting. Table 10's results from the discriminant

analysis support this view. Ideological factors as a set are more important than sophistication factors, and the discriminatory power is relatively high.

INSERT TABLE 11 HERE

Mass-Activist Linkages

Thus far, we have found the following patterns at the mass level: there is more single-issue voting against both issues than for both issues; anti-voters differ little from extremists in terms of either ideology or sophistication (the latter is especially true for the abortion issue); pro voters differ in both ideology and sophistication from extremists. Consequently, there are different dynamics on the two sides of these issues. We would argue that on the anti side it is a fairly clear-cut translation of extreme attitudes into action; probably there is an element of "hard-issue" voting, though the easy nature of the issues may prompt more action, especially on the E.R.A. Further, we would assert that on the pro side it is clearly "easy-issue" voting.

At the activist level, on the other hand, the dynamics seem to be the same on both sides of the issues. Single-issue voting is associated with a very extreme constellation of attitudes but not with a lack of sophistication. Finally, pro single-issue voting is much less frequent than is voting against. What might link the behavior at the mass level to that at the activist level?

We would argue that to some extent the masses take their cues from political activists. After all, activists in groups are probably quite important in symbolically defining an issue, along with the media. The preponderance of research (Boles, 1979; Jaffe, 1981) on the abortion and

E.R.A. issues focuses on the group conflict and often on the activities of single leaders, witness Phyllis Schlafly on the anti-E.R.A. side. In fact, her home state of Illinois is the only state we know of where a public opinion poll (NBC News, 1980:78) has discovered a plurality (42%) opposed to the E.R.A.

At the activist level, at least in our sample, there appears to be a considerable difference in what is considered to be an acceptable or viable tactic. Our data indicate that pro activists on both issues, though especially on abortion, are simply much less willing to employ single-issue voting as a tactic. Those who do appear to be ideologically motivated. In contrast, the antis on both issues seem to see single-issue voting as a much more powerful tool; thus, they are more willing or more likely to turn to that tactic. In earlier work (Conover and Gray, 1981) we found a similar difference in another possible form of single-minded behavior: belonging to conservative or liberal groups. Over 60% of the antis said they belonged to at least one conservative group identified with the New Right, whereas only 30% of the pros reported membership in a clearly anti-New Right group. Yet, a majority of activists on both sides were moderately to highly involved in politics.

This difference in messages from the pro and anti sides seems to have filtered down to the masses. The antis who are strongly motivated by ideology willingly embrace single-issue voting. In contrast, pros who are ideologically motivated for the most part spurn single-issue voting, just like most activists on the pro side. Apparently, the pros at the mass level have been used to other methods. This means that single-issue voting on the pro side, when it occurs, tends <u>not</u> to be ideologically

motivated. Rather, it is likely to be a product of "easy" single-issue voting, that is, not ideologically motivated.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, our findings provide insights into the nature of the abortion and the E.R.A. issues, as well as single-issue politics in general. First, in order to understand the nature of single-issue politics, the issue itself must be focused upon. In this regard, we suggested that single-issues are symbolized in a condensational fashion, and they have been on the political agenda for some time. They tend to be issues that are "easy" to issue vote on. In turn, the broad symbolization of an issue in terms of conflict over basic values helps to ensure its longevity. Issues defined in terms of several basic value conflicts should endure for long periods of time. This would appear to be the case for both abortion and the E.R.A. There is some evidence that voters are increasingly willing to single-issue vote on the abortion issue, for example. National polls in 1976 and 1978 reported between 7-15% were willing to single-issue vote (evenly divided between supporters and opponents); by 1979, 39% were willing to, with opponents nearly twice as likely to do so (Jaffe, 1981: 107-108).

Secondly, an explanation of single-issue politics also needs to focus on the attributes of individuals at the mass level as well as the nature of the issue. In this respect, our findings for these two issues suggest that single-minded behavior on the opposing side tends to be an outgrowth of extremely conservative attitudes, occasionally facilitated by lack of sophistication. On the part of supporters, it is a product of lack of sophistication, not ideology. Thus, examination of single-issue voting

helps to answer a puzzling question--namely, why, despite the fact that they are in the minority, are the opponents of abortion and the E.R.A. presently defeating the majority proponents? One explanation for this disparity is that, at least in terms of voting, there is more ideologically motivated single-issue activity on the anti side than on the pro side of these issues. The behavior of voters in November 1980 provides a recent electoral example of the differential importance supporters and opponents place on the E.R.A. and abortion issues. A high proportion of those opposing the E.R.A. (75%) and abortion (61%) voted for Ronald Reagan; supporters of those two sides (54% and 42%, respectively) less often went for Carter (NBC News, 1981: 12-13).

Third, an explanation of single-issue politics should consider the role of interest group leaders in helping to symbolize issues, in keeping them on the systemic and formal agendas, and in shaping the views of the masses. In our sample of activists, both sides were ideologically motivated (and, as one would expect, fairly sophisticated) but opponents were much more likely to use single-issue tactics than were supporters. This differential level of activity can be observed at the national level as well. Between 1975 and 1981 the number of groups actively campaigning and lobbying on these two issues has grown enormously; by our count, the major opposing groups (not counting those who have simply taken a stand) outnumber the supporting groups. While in the past few supporting groups engaged in single-issue tactics, there is evidence (e.g., Halva-Neubauer, 1981) that they are now switching tactics. This suggests that activists will ensure that these two issues remain single-issues in the 1980s. Whichever side ultimately loses on the issues of abortion and the E.R.A. loses much more

than those two issues; it loses the broader symbolic battle over which life style and which set of values will be accepted as the norm in American society. With the stakes so high, it is no wonder that the battle has been so intense.

Table 1: Distribution of Responses on the Abortion Scale

	Mass Sample	Activist Sample
Never or only one circumstance (0-1)	17.2%	47.7%
Almost never (2-3)	35.3	13.1
Almost always (4-6)	21.9	11.2
Always (7)	25.6	28.0
	100 % (n = 1162)	100 % (n = 107)

Table 2: Distribution of Responses on the E.R.A. Question

	Mass Sample	Activist Sample
Strongly oppose	8.3%	39.3%
Oppose	16.9	10.2
Uncertain	13.9	1.0
Favor	40.2	16.8
Strongly favor	20.7	32.7
	100 % (n = 1227)	100 % (n = 107)

Table 3: Frequency Distribution of Single-Issue Voters on Abortion and the E.R.A., Mass and Activist Samples

	Mass Sample		Activist Sample	
Single-Issue Vote	Abortion	E.R.A.	Abortion	E.R.A.
YES	9.0%	6.8%	22.1%	29.2%
NO	91.0	93.2	77.9	70.8
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
(N)	(1183)	(1162)	(n=104)	(n=106)

Table 4

Relationships of E.R.A. Opinions and
Single-Issue Voting

SINGLE-ISSUE VOTE	E.R.A. ATTITUDES: Mass Sample				Activist Sample			
	Strongly Favor	Favor	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Favor	Favor	Oppose	Strongly Oppose
YES	9.7%	4.0%	5.0%	13.8%	17.6%	0%	18.2%	52.4%
NO	90.3	96.0	95.0	86.2	82.4	100	81.8	47.6
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100.0%	100.0%
(N)	(247)	(482)	(200)	(94)	(34)	(18)	(11)	(42)

Table 5

Relationship of Abortion Opinions
and Single-Issue Voting

SINGLE-ISSUE VOTE	ABORTION ATTITUDES							
	Mass Sample				Activist Sample			
	Never	Almost Never	Almost Always	Always	Never	Almost Never	Almost Always	Always
YES	34.8%	9.4%	6.2%	6.7%	57.1%	21.0%	0	7.1%
NO	65.2	90.6	93.8	93.3	42.9	79.0	100.0	92.9
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
(N)	(93)	(535)	(258)	(297)	(21)	(43)	(12)	(28)

Table 6: Attitudinal and Demographic Composition of Extremists and Single Issue Voters on the E.R.A., Mass Sample

	Anti Extremists (N=81)	Anti Voters (N=191)	Pro Extremists (N=164)	Pro Voters (N-232)	
Liberalism					
Liberal	8	17	40	36	
Moderate	40	30	33	36	
Conservative	52	52	27	27	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Sex Role					
Traditional	52%	70%	11%	21%	*
Middle	34	30	38	49	
Liberated	14	0	52	30	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Women's Status					
Traditional	57%	41%	10%	17%	*
Middle	25	41	20	29	
Liberated	18	18	69	54	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Morality					
Traditional	58%	74%	11%	27%	*
Middle	30	13	34	27	
Liberated	12	13	55	46	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Education					
<12	17%	30%	8%	16%	*
12	42	44	32	43	
12-15	24	22	23	21	
>16	17	4	37	21	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Church Attendance					
never or almost never	23%	14%	40%	39%	
monthly or almost monthly	21	27	33	36	
weekly	56	59	27	26	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Income					
<10,000	21%	52%	22%	33%	
10,000-20,000	41	29	32	31	
20,000-30,000	23	14	29	26	
>30,000	16	5	17	10	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	

*=difference of means test with uncollapsed scales is significant at .05 level.

Table 7

Discriminant Analysis Results, Mass Sample

Structure Coefficients	Anti E.R.A. (N=81)	Pro E.R.A. (N=191)	Anti Abortion (N=164)	Pro Abortion (N=232)
LIB/CON	-.13	-.35	.12	-.19
SEX ROLES	.15	.47	-.12	.84
WOMEN'S STATUS	.22	.40	-.09	.43
MORALITY	.17	.80	-.43	.44
EDUC	1.00	.84	.06	.34
INCOME	.34	.18	.11	.48
CHURCH ATTD.	-.05	-.16	1.00	-.37
Group Centroids				
Single-Issue Voters	-.45	-.61	.28	-1.15
Extremist Non Voters	.15	.13	-.12	.15
Cannonical Correlation	.25	.27	.18	.39
Percent Correctly Classified	72.1 %	65.8 %	49.5 %	74.3 %

Table 8: Attitudinal and Demogarphic Composition of Extremists and Single-Issue Voters on Abortion, Mass Sample

	Anti Extremists (N=159)	Anti Voters (N=71)	Pro Extremists (N=280)	Pro Voters (N=36)	
Liberalism					
Liberal	13	10	35	29	
Moderate	41	41	36	34	
Conservative	46	49	29	37	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Sex Role					
Traditional	37%	47%	13%	31%	*
Middle	41	38	42	46	
Liberated	19	16	45	23	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Women's Status					
Traditional	32%	42%	10%	31%	*
Middle	37	28	26	23	
Liberated	31	30	64	46	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Morality					
Traditional	53%	69%	8%	14%	*
Middle	32	19	27	53	
Liberated	15	12	65	33	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Education					
<12	20%	13%	8%	22%	*
12	42	41	36	42	
12-15	18	28	24	14	
>16	20	18	32	22	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Church Attendance					
never or almost never	17	9	* 51%	38%	
monthly or almost monthly	20	13	33	32	
weekly	63	78	16	29	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Income					
<10,000	30%	25%	17%	43%	*
10,000-20,000	37	30	36	21	
20,000-30,000	12	25	27	21	
>30,000	11	21	20	14	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	

* = difference of means tests with unrecoded scales is significant at .05 level.

Table 9: Attitudinal and Demographic Composition of Single-Issue Voters vs. Non-Voters on E.R.A., Activist Sample

	Anti Non-Voters (N=29)	Anti Voters (N=24)	Pro Non-Voters (N=46)	Pro Voters (N=6)
Liberalism				
Liberal	11%	0% *	46%	33%
Moderate	46	12	54	67
Conservative	43	88	0	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sex Role				
Traditional	24%	46 *	0%	0% *
Middle	69	50	28	0
Liberated	7	4	72	100
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Women's Status				
Traditional	7%	62% *	0	0 *
Middle	55	38	15	0
Liberated	38	0	85	100%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Morality				
Traditional	69%	92%*	7	0 *
Middle	31	8	30	0
Liberated	0	0	63	100
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Education				
<12	3%	0%	2	0
12	10	12	4	0
13-15	35	38	4	17
>16	52	50	90	83
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Church Attendance				
never or almost never	7%	12%	31%	83% *
monthly or almost monthly	10	0	33	17
every week	83	88	36	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Income				
<10,000	4%	10%	2	0
10,000-20,000	25	0	15	0
20,000-30,000	36	55	33	17
>30,000	35	35	50	83
	100%	100%	100%	100%

* = a Difference of Means Tests using unrecoded scales is significant at the .05 level.

Table 10

Discriminant Analysis Results, Activist Sample

Structure Coefficients	Anti E.R.A. (N=47)	Pro E.R.A. (N=49)	Anti Abortion (N=57)
LIB/CON	-.69	.33	-.79
SEX ROLES	.73	-.40	.80
WOMEN'S STATUS	1.00	-.35	.71
MORALITY	.71	-.53	1.000
EDUC	.33	.01	.26
INCOME	-.21	-.03	.20
CHURCH ATTENDANCE	-.35	1.00	-.53
Group Centroids			
S.I. Voters	-.90	-1.19	-.83
Non Voters	.66	.17	.35
Canonical Correlation	.62	.41	.48
Percent Correctly Classified	79.0%	71.0%	72.0%

Table 11: Attitudinal and Demographic Composition of Single-Issue Voters and Non-Voters on Abortion, Activist Sample

	Anti Non-Voters(N=43)	Anti Voters(N-21)	
Liberalism			*
Liberal	10%	0%	
Moderate	50	25	
Conservative	40	75	
	100%	100%	
Sex Role			*
Traditional	23	33	
Middle	60	62	
Liberated	17	5	
	100%	100%	
Women's Status			*
Traditional	12	52	
Middle	49	33	
Liberated	39	15	
	100%	100%	
Morality			*
Traditional	54	100	
Middle	42	0	
Liberated	4	0	
	100%	100%	
Education			
<12	5	0	
12	9	10	
13-15	30	29	
>16	56	61	
	100%	100%	
Church Attendance			
never or almost never	14	10	
monthly or almost monthly	7	0	
every week	79	90	
	100%	100%	
Income			
<10,000	2	11	
10,000-20,000	22	6	
20,000-30,000	37	50	
>30,000	39	33	
	100%	100%	

NOTES

1. Bennett (1980) suggests the following definition for a symbol: "a symbol is any communication device that represents or stands for some other thing. Communication occurs when symbols that provide a meaningful image are substituted for the thing a person wants to address."

2. One way this might happen (though not necessarily the only way) is that the issue conflict becomes associated with a party cleavage.

3. This data was collected on one of the surveys complied by the ongoing "Minnesota Poll" which is sponsored by the Minnesota Tribune. Trained interview were, of course employed. Samples of this size have a sampling error of approximately $\pm$ 3.5.

4. This sampling procedure was made possible by the fact that we received a list of all the delegates attending the conference shortly before the conference bagan. The interviews were personally administered by one of ten trained interviewers, and lasted on average forty minutes.

5. The question was: "Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose the Equal Rights Amendment?"

6. The question was: "We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Do you think of yourself as a liberal or a conservative, or haven't you thought much about it?" The response "moderate" was also recorded.

7. The exact wording of the questions is the same as that of questions 186a, b, c, and d in the General Social Surveys, 1972-1978 Codebook, compiled by NORC at the University of Chicago, pp. 153-154.

8. The exact wording of the questions is the same as that of variable numbers 3802, 3811, 3813 in the American National Election Series Codebook: 1972, 1974, and 1976 Volume 1, compiled by the Center for Political Studies and made available by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

9. The morality scale is composed of answers to the following four questions:
   1) "Next, there's been a lot of discusssion about the way morals and attitudes about sex are changing in this country. If a man and a woman have sexual relations before marriage, do you think it is almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?"
   2) "NOW I'M GOING TO READ YOU SOME STATEMENTS AND ASK YOU WHETHER YOU AGREE WITH OR DISAGREE WITH EACH ONE. THE FIRST ONE IS: Birth control information should be available to anyone who wants it."

3) "Looking at or reading sexual materials (or pornography) leads to breakdown of morals."
4) "What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex -- do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?"

10. It is unclear how much to make of the activists' greater willingness to vote on abortion than on the E.R.A. This may be unique to our sample rather than to activists in general.

11. The categories used for the variables liberalism, education, church attendance, and income are evident from Table 6. The categories used for the other variables are as follows: sex role, traditional = responses 4-9, middle = responses 10-15, liberated = responses 16-20; women's status, traditional = responses 3-7, middle = responses 9-11, liberated = responses 13-15; morality, traditional = responses 4-8, middle = responses 9-13, liberated = responses 14-19.

12. The same pattern appears when only the extremist nonvoters are considered.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Roger. 1980. The Ohio Alliance for Returnables: A 'Single Issue' Group in Action. A paper prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, April 24-26, 1980.

Bennett, W. Lance. 1980. Public Opinion in American Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.

Boles, Janet K. 1979. The Politics of the Equal Rights Amendment: Conflict and the Decision Process. New York: Longman, Inc.

Brady, David W., and Kent L. Tedin. 1976. Ladies in Pink: Religion and Political Ideology in the Anti-ERA Movement. Social Science Quarterly, 56 (March, 1976): 564-575.

Carmines, Edward C. and James A. Stimson. 1980. The Two Faces of Issue Voting. The American Political Science Review, 74 (March, 1980): 78-91.

Casey, Gregory. 1980. Understanding Single Issue Politics Through Q-Methodology: The Case of Abortion. A paper prepared for delivery at the 1980 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Pick Congress Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, April 1980.

Conover, Pam, Steve Coombs, and Virginia Gray. 1980. The Attitudinal Roots of Single-Issue Politics: The Case of 'Women's Issues.' A paper prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., August 28-31, 1980.

Conover, Pamela Johnston and Virginia Gray. 1981. Political Activists and the Conflict Over Abortion and the E.R.A.: Pro-Family vs. Pro-women. A paper prepared for delivery at the 1981 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Stouffers Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 16-18, 1981.

Cobb, Roger W. and Charles D. Elder. 1973. The Political Uses of Symbolism. American Politics Quarterly, 1 (July, 1973): 305-338.

Crawford, Alan. 1980. Thunder on the Right. New York: Pantheon Books.

Edelman, Murray. 1964. The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Halva-Neubauer, Glen. 1981. Abortion Issue Divisiveness in Minnesota. Unpublished paper, University of Minnesota.

Jaffe, Frederick S. 1981. Abortion Politics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Jones, Judson H. 1980. The Effect of the Pro- and Anti-ERA 'Single Interest' Groups on Voting Behavior on the Equal Rights Amendment in the Illinois General Assembly. A paper prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1980.

Ladd, Everett, Jr. 1978. The New Lines are Drawn...Class and Ideology in America. Public Opinion, 1 (July/August, 1978): 48-53.

Merrick, Janna C. and Stephen I. Frank. 1980. Single-Issue Politics: The Case of Abortion in Minnesota. A paper prepared for delivery at the 1980 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Pick Congress Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, April 24-26, 1980.

NBC News. 1981. Decision 80: General Election Poll Results. New York: NBC News.

Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. The Semi-Sovereign People. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sears, David O., Richard R. Lau, Tom R. Tyler and Harris M. Allen, Jr. 1980. Self-Interest vs. Symbolic Politics in Policy Attitudes and Presidential Voting. American Political Science Review, 74 (September 1980): 670-684.

Single-Issue Politics. 1978. Newsweek, November 6, 1978: 48-60.

Skerry, Peter. 1978. The Class Conflict Over Abortion. The Public Interest, 52 (Summer 1978): 69-84.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., Barbara Kaye Wolfinger, Kenneth Prewitt, and Sheilah Rosenhack. 1969. America's Radical Right: Politics and Ideology. In Robert A. Schoenberger (ed.) The American Right Wing. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.